Dear Howard,

1/17/72

Our most recent guest has just left. Gary returns from DC with me tomorrow to remain for several days, and the end of the week I go to NYC, so I've little time and a stack of mail. My thumb is getting along well. I can now use to it button, take the cap of toothpaste, etc. Tomorrow the stitches come out.

Noe complaint about you on the phone matter. I had not told you not to talk about it simply because I didn't think Jerry would persist in spying out what I had made clear to him I didn't want to talk about. We are having it out and I think he is coming to understand things better. So much of this is new to him, beyond his experience, and with both a good mind and a good disposition he just want's to know all he can so he can do all he can. I don't think you should fault yourself, as you have. But those kinds of stupidities, which at best exacerbate and at worst are counter-productive, have to be reduced to the absolute minimum. I'm tired of making all the compromises and having to confront so many of the problems too alone.

There is too much to do to engage in debates about things like the Wecht business. I may or may not be right but I have my own touchstones, my own experiences, and in them I do trust, not the vaporiaings of detached fine minds or the limited experience of others. There is too much new that va;idates too many of the smaller things that had attracted my attention and I'm just not going to waste time trying to convince those who won't listen or disagree yet have no real laternatives or other explanations for what they do not address. I have been doing much more than you know, much more than I should have, and at whatever cost I will do what I feel I must. Jerry will be sending you some copies.

Your formulation that I have asked others to think in a way that is "totally ambiguous" is totally invalid. Asode from not going into the many reason why I would prefer to avoid giving my conclusions in advance to so many who so instinctively oppose them simply because they are mine or running the risk of preconditioning the minds of those I do want to think independently, this was in one context to all and added contexts to Wecht. The one I addressed to all should be enough: I could see great harm coming to us from Wecht seeing the stuff under certain conditions. I submit this is more than enough to serve as a basis of though and more than enough to eliminate your description. Nor is it a question of t inking like I do. It should be the opposite. Remember all about those blooming flowers? Are you arguing that I should submit to the ignorant in your 1/13 comment about the Kennedys as suppressors? I not that not one of those I was addressing did any think or asked me for me information to serve as a basis of more t inking -of the very few who responded at. This is the reality with which I live, not some idle concepts of approaches and arcane subtlties. It also makes a greater size for the problem with which I seek to cope. Other factors I will not elaborate are involved and are beyond your understanding and are of a character that precludes my telling you. I will not write more than I have, and as you will see I have written more than you know, the central point being the timing, as long as I face the stubborn insistence upon the reliving of the past by those who neither do otherwise nor help others do otherwise. At this point I couldn't care less what Wecht says to or thinks of me, and his sending Sylvia a copy of what I wrote him was a premeditated evil. This is separate from my high opinion of his professional competence and his genuine interest in the subject, for which none of us owe him anything. We would if he did something to help, as he can and as he has steadfastly refused to. He has even refsued to inform himself because it would cost him money. You can read the file at any time you want. You will find many who will tell you that I am ego-tripping, and which os us really knows if he is, but I think close analysis and full information may be more persuasive that the piety of those who say or persuade themselves this is true is a psychological device and they are the ones really doing it. You use the words jealous and ungrateful. Please tell me of whom I have any cause to be jealous, or to whom I should feel grateful? Come on Howard, young as you are, you ought be more mature than that. You have read my work, know its origins, know those who could have helped and how and didn't, and know the few who did and my appreciations

a

Should I be grateful to Cyril for forcing me to write him 6-10 letters to get a couple of lousy pages on spectros, etc that he did promise and not increasing my work load further by never sending them? Or anything else, ever, including last week when he sent others what they could not use and I got too late, second-hand, to use with maximum effectiveness -something he could have told a secretary to do 3-4 months ago? Or for letting me bakkground him on my work, so he'd know more than he did? Or for giving him the understabdin of the panel report he failed to gain for himself when I had a copy sent him? Should I be grateful to Sylvia for sending money to Thornley when he and Lifton were openly campaigning against me and threatening to sue me for nothing? And who has done what of which I should beel jealous? I do not feel it necessary to defend my work and if anyone knows how open I am with my files you do. Sow what basis do you find in what you appear to have been brainwashed into? I think you too sharp for that kind of stuff.

You abpve all know how little it is possible for us to learn if Cyril sees this stuff now. That is something less than a benediction in itself. But if you are going to feel you must take a position on the controversy, I think you should begin by seeking any response to my earliest warnings and proposal of a way around it. Or to the total absence of anything but slander in the last letter I got from Cyril, accusing me of panhandling. For anyone to have a legitimate position opposed to mine in this matter, I think he must be prepared to show that Cyril, even if antagonized by what I wrote and how I wrote it, was this great pateint man of only selfless dedication everyone seems to be painting him, wrote and said, with this conxsummate tolerance, soory, I don't understand what you are talking about. Please explain more of the basis of your fears. Or that he used the phone that costs him nothing to make the same kind of inquiries. Untill you show me something like this, don t waste your time or mine in pointless argument. I <u>am</u> addressing motive, recognized or unrecognized, intended or subconscipus. I may be wrong, but I also feel I have more than enough warrant for having questions about motive, too, not just the stupidity of the approach and the anti-intellectual but unquestionable refusal to think.

Saving face is the last thing that interest me and whether you agree or not, I think the least of the factors involved, if it is at all save for those who are now ashamed and are beginning to understand how right I was. Their faces can have any color that now comes naturally. I will waste not one minute on such childishness with adults. And if I can correctly evaluate my own motives and what is in my mind, it is not a mere matter of credit which, regardless of your ignorance of it, is something those to whom you have been listening have been studious in avpiding while active in unattributed quotation. At this point I will not argue whether Cyril should see the stuff, will see it, what the consequences will or can be, because it is necessary to addres not his face bus the protection of our asses, and to the degree I can, that I shall try. Your beliefs are you own affair and you are certainly entitled to them. But there is one thing I want you to be aware of, regardless of cost to all of us: at this point I will not, under any circumstances, permit the use of any of my material by any of these people for any purposes. That I will permit only when the book is printed. And I will at least try to deal harshly with those who may make the ffort, more if they do it. This kind of this has got to stop or, aside from my personal rights and interest, there is no survival for us. That includes 100% of my owrk on the Kennedys. I have thought of many alternatives, I've not been asked for them by those with whom it could make a difference. And you had better understand that the lattimer thing misfired badly, probably backfired, but that you may, meanwhile, be one of its victims. If you are, you should then be asking yourself about those to whom I addressed such a warning in September. Had each of th ose of means not been so intent upon making of himself the great hero, we could have had our greatest success with this Lattimer thing. As it is, we got nothing but minor and really meaningless attention, more to build Cyril personally, before an audience that is without the means of doing anything with it, witness the void since then. You should also understand that I am sick and tired odf direct and indirect lectures from those who visualize themselves as sitting thrones, who sit back and do little but pontificate, especially when they are doing no work on the case, by their abdications leave what amounts to the entire load to me when something like this happens, and I have to lay

aside what none of them is doing, work, to carry what load I can. If you disagree, donqt bother to tell me. I'm beginning to develop some pretty rxigx rigid attitudes, I am aware of it, and I will decide within the next couple of weeks whether to make them more rigid. In the past I have been incapable of it. I think maybe now I may not be. Little things I otherwise might ignore, as I have for years, have come to the point where they have handicapped effort, and from them I read more than you can or perhaps would if you knew. Understand also that only on the basis of fact and logic will I consider the opinions of others, and when they relate to something like what we are now into, I may well ignore everything without some accompanying bona fides. There just isn't time for what I have done here, and I will try to avoid so using it in the future. But I think I owe it to you to try and make you understand, including things of which you have shown no awareness and which I feel I can't inform you.

Your letter of the 11th is very nice and we do appreciate it, as we do the enclosure. Of you book, I think you really want to be alert to what Tink may do that you may not detect. He will have a considerable compulsion to self-justification, and it may influence his arguments about content, approaches, etc., with the press. I have a low opinion of his character, as you know I do of his work. If you'd heard him say some of the things I have, you'd better understand this. I think you should ask him if he has loaned, given or in any way communicated any of what you have that you think Lifton didn't, and I think if he gives you less than an unequivocal answer, you should think much. Tink is a fairly open crook, and he would have no scruple in stealing from you as he did from me, even if for Lifton.

The tipping of all these things should get some thought. There is every commerical reason for the Bishop book, a real bomb, not being serialized, yet it is, in the Post, too. After a book is a failure this is rare, and after publication is in itself unusual.

I've no time for more. Thanks and best,